

ESSENTIAL REFERENCE PAPER 'O': CHAPTER 9 - VILLAGES

Question 39: Approach to Development in the Villages

Please rank the approaches to development in the villages in order of preference? Is there another approach we have not considered?

44 people/organisations provided comments in relation to Question 39. These included:

- 19 Individuals
- 10 Developers/landowners/agents/businesses
- 6 Stakeholders/organisations including:
 - Environment Agency
 - Epping Forest District Council
 - Haileybury School
 - Lee Valley Regional Park
 - Tewin Residents Group
 - The Thatching Information Service
- 9 Town and Parish Councils including:
 - Aston
 - Bramfield
 - Braughing
 - Great Munden
 - Standon
 - Stanstead Abbots
 - Tewin
 - Thorley
 - Thundridge

Q39 - Summary Comment	Q39 - Detailed Comment
Density generally	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density should only be determined on a site by site / village by village basis • Design should take precedence over any artificial notions of minimum density • Lower/medium density jointly preferred • Providing houses for people who will by necessity have to commute to places of work whether that housing is high or low density and depleting the already scarce resource of agricultural land does address the problems of the region as a whole
Lower density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The least unacceptable development in villages would be lower density, however, even this is unacceptable and generally unwanted by local people • Lower density makes more sense as the nature of village life is by definition non-urban • Family homes should be lower density
Medium density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For village extensions a medium density of 30-40 dwellings/ha should be the norm, whilst respecting urban design and landscape criteria • Starter homes should be medium density • If you are using this information simply to generate numbers of houses and land area utilised by the end of the period average it out on medium but please do not apply this as the recommended approach when individual developments are being considered • Medium density preferred assumption for a 'rule of thumb' exercise
Higher density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher density is preferable in order to safeguard green belt/countryside, but sometimes medium density would enable more self-sufficiency in terms of vegetable growing and children's safe play space • Higher density preferred to concentrate homes near service and to minimise greenfield/green belt land • Higher density but no more than 12 dwellings in any one development
Neighbourhood planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow parish plans • Allow communities to decide what is most appropriate • Stanstead Abbots Parish Council wish to record their intention to develop a Parish Plan
Miscellaneous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development needs to be considered from a different viewpoint. The main criterion should be – does the village/town need development to remain a sustainable community? • Adding houses to villages does not in itself keep them vibrant, there also has to be local employment opportunities • There is an excess of large detached executive dwellings in the district and a limit should be imposed; more semi's with room for later growth are needed • There should be no major increases in population density until the necessary infrastructure is in place • Logical infill only – no linear expansion • Decisions on densities will be affected by flood risk considerations and should be informed by the SFRA. In order to promote sequentially preferable sites it may be necessary to promote higher density developments in order to avoid encroaching into the floodplain. Where flood risk is not a constraint to development, lower densities may be achievable • Care should be taken to minimise development in the villages or they will cease to be villages
Ranking Only	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ranking explanation only, no additional comments made
Site Specific Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burrs Meadow, Standon • Land at High Trees Farm, Chapmore End • Land at Amwell Place Farm, Hertford Heath • The Wilderness, Stanstead Abbots • Watton-at-Stone Depot, Station Road, Watton-at-Stone

Comments received to Q39 in respect of other issues in Chapter 9

Q39 - Summary Comment	Q39 - Detailed Comment
Q40: Village Identification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Braughing should not be identified as a Larger Service Village • Stanstead Abbots and St Margarets is incorrectly identified as a Larger Service Village; it should be a town • Stanstead Abbots is incorrectly identified as a Larger Service Village for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much of the village lies in a flood risk area • The primary school is now at capacity • Rail passenger congestion and limited bus service
Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for new and explicit smaller village related policies which will support village service and enable village residents to stay in the village in which they live
Stanstead Abbots	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Lee Valley Regional Park Authority is concerned about the impact of growth on the Park in relation to options for Stanstead Abbots and St Margarets
Conversion of employment land/premises to residential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue raised in respect of Stanstead Abbots; wish to retain and sustain a thriving High Street economy

Comments received to Q39 in respect of other Chapters

Chapter 2: Key Issues and Vision

Q39 - Summary Comment	Q39 - Detailed Comment
Theme 3: Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East Herts should carry out a needs assessment for the types of dwellings that are needed in each area • New social housing must give priority to local people on the housing register
Theme 4: Character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for Strategic Objectives CHA 1-4
Theme 6: On the Move	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport infrastructure is already strained
Theme 9: Monitoring & Delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any development in Stanstead Abbots needs to take account of capacity constraints at Rye Meads

Chapter 3: Development Strategy

Q39 - Summary Comment	Q39 - Detailed Comment
Development Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SHMA outline that for market housing in East Herts 71.7% should be 3 bedrooms or larger, in part to reverse the trend of providing flatted developments. Housing allocations must therefore be in locations which are appropriate for houses rather than flats • Allocation of numbers of houses to Smaller Service Villages in Option C must be based on need • Option B is considered to best reflect national planning guidance • It is not necessarily the larger villages that need to expand; modest growth can assist small village communities while also providing affordable housing • Option F is the 'Jeremy Clarkson solution' • Option F might attract a disproportionate number of commuters
Green Belt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East Herts should plan for development without impacting on the Green Belt
Flooding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the east of the county in particular there is an increased threat of flooding and building in these areas will make matters worse

Question 40: Identifying Types of Village

Is our approach to identifying three types of village (Larger Service Villages, Smaller Service Villages and Other Villages / Hamlets) correct?

52 people/organisations provided comments in relation to Question 40. These included:

- 23 Individuals
- 14 Developers/landowners/agents/businesses
- 2 Stakeholder/organisations including:
 - Epping Forest District Council
 - Haileybury School
- 13 Parish Councils including:
 - Aston
 - Bayford
 - Braughing
 - Brickendon Liberty
 - Cottered
 - Great Munden
 - Hertford Heath
 - Standon
 - Stanstead Abbotts
 - Tewin
 - Thundridge
 - Walkern
 - Watton-at-Stone

Q40 - Summary Comment	Q40 - Detailed Comment
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approach to 3 types of villages • Approach correct but query allocation of villages • Approach correct/reasonable but must consider needs of village individually • Largely correct except where 'other villages' are located in an existing transport corridor • Fine as a high level planning exercise, but open to challenge from individual villages
Overall approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too general; villages should be considered individually • More categories of village required e.g. large villages with few amenities; large villages with good amenities • Potential for 'village clusters' • Identification of villages should have regard to access to public services (including public transport) and sustainability, not just size and level of services • What is a 'limited range of local facilities'? • All villages need some limited development • Would prefer continuation of Local Plan categorisation (i.e. Category 1, 2 & 3) • New development should be located where there is the greatest potential for achieving sustainable development • Not villages in transport corridors – few are within walking distance on a station
Sustainability trap	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for smaller service villages and other villages/hamlets to evolve through accommodating growth and thereby avoiding a 'sustainability trap'
Neighbourhood Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role of neighbourhood plans and community right to build
Site specific comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Half Acres, Stortford Road, • Land north west of Great Amwell

Comments received to Q40 in respect of other issues in Chapter 9

Q40 - Summary Comment	Q40 - Detailed Comment
Categorisation of villages: correctly identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stanstead Abbots & St Margarets is correctly identified as a Larger Service Village • Braughing is correctly identified as a Larger Service Village
Categorisation of villages: incorrectly identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hunsdon has been incorrectly identified as a Larger Service Village • Braughing has been incorrectly identified as a Larger Service Village • Standon/Puckeridge should be considered together as a Larger Service Village • Great Amwell is a sustainable location for development – proximity to Ware gives it an advantage over other larger villages • Brickendon has been incorrectly identified as a 'Smaller Service Village'; it should be categorised as an 'Other Village/Hamlet' • Tewin has been incorrectly identified as a Larger Service Village; it should be a Smaller Service Village • Stanstead Abbots & St Margarets should retain its classification as a main settlement • Stanstead Abbots and Watton-at-Stone offer a better prospect for sustainable development than Buntingford even though it is a larger settlement • Detailed comments on whether or not Stanstead Abbots is correctly identified as a larger Service Village • Walkern lacks most of the facilities that many other Category 1 Villages have
Historic Character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Braughing particular attention should be paid to the character and significance of the historic environment
Miscellaneous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistency between maps as to how Stanstead Abbots is portrayed – sometimes on its own, sometimes with St Margarets

Comments received to Q40 in respect of other Chapters

Chapter 3: Development Strategy

Q40 - Summary Comment	Q40 - Detailed Comment
Housing Figure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'To find' housing figure is too high as East of England Plan has been revoked
Option F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A disadvantage of Option F could be that development on transport corridors could attract a disproportionate number of commuters – resulting in dormitory villages
Q23: Approaches to housing distribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannot support proposed approaches as they are based on simple numerical divisions without reference to the potential for achieving sustainable development. The Core Strategy should consider potential development strategies which would allow a more nuanced approach to the level of development to be allocated to each settlement

Question 41: Village Identification

Have we identified the correct villages under each village type?

253 people/organisations provided comments in relation to Question 41. These included:

- 222 Individuals
- 15 Developers/landowners/agents/businesses
- 4 Organisations including
 - Broxbourne Woods Area Conservation Society
 - Epping Forest District Council
 - Hertfordshire Biological Records Centre
 - Hertfordshire County Council – Passenger Transport Unit
 - Tewin Residents Group
 - The Thatching Information Service
- 10 Town and Parish Councils including:
 - Aston
 - Braughing
 - Brickendon Liberty
 - Cottered
 - Hertford Heath
 - Standon
 - Stanstead Abbots
 - Tewin
 - Walkern
 - Watton-at-Stone

Q41 - Summary Comment	Q41 - Detailed Comment
General support for approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of Larger and Smaller Service Villages seems reasonable • Depends on your definitions but it looks about right • Support categorisation identified, but provision needs to be made for villages to become more sustainable • General support, but there should be no significant development
Village has been <u>correctly</u> identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aston is correctly identified as a Smaller Service Village • Braughing is correctly identified as a Larger Service Village • Hertford Heath is correctly identified as a Larger Service Village • High Cross is correctly identified as a Larger Service Village • Hunsdon is correctly identified as a Larger Service Village • Stanstead Abbots & St Margarets is correctly identified as a Larger Service Village • Walkern is correctly identified a Larger Service Village • Watton-at-Stone is correctly identified as a Larger Service Village
Village has been <u>incorrectly</u> identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No development in or around Aston • Aston is more like a hamlet • Bayford could be a centre for development based on the railway station • Benington should be a Larger Service Village • Support for Benington as a Smaller Service Village but only if these villages are allowed a reasonable and flexible margin for future housing growth • Braughing is not a Larger Service Village • Braughing should be a Smaller Service Village • Brickendon is not a service village • Brickendon should be an Other Village/Hamlet • Buntingford should be a Larger Service Village • Although Buntingford is a town, it is very different to in terms of size, populations and infrastructure to the other 4 • Dane End should be identified for expansion because of traffic and flooding issues • Great Amwell should be a Larger Service Village • Great Amwell should be an Other Village/Hamlet • Hertford Heath should not be a Larger Service Village • Hertford Heath should be a Smaller Service Village • High Cross is not a Larger Service Village • High Cross should be a Smaller Service Village • High Cross should be an Other Village/Hamlet • High Wych should be considered with Sawbridgeworth • High Wych should be a Larger Service Village • Hunsdon is not a Larger Service Village • Hunsdon should be a Smaller Service Village • Little Hadham should see some growth • Much Hadham should be a Smaller Service Village • No development in Much Hadham • Puckeridge is not a Larger Service Village • Puckeridge should be a Smaller Service Village • Puckeridge should be a town • To identify Puckeridge as being capable for expansion shows a lack of local knowledge; it is gridlocked with congestion, parking is an issue and the original village has largely disappeared within mass low-grade housing • Sawbridgeworth should be a Larger Service Village • Sawbridgeworth is not the same scale as Bishop's Stortford, Hertford, Ware etc • Standon/Puckeridge should be a Larger Service Village

Q41 - Summary Comment	Q41 - Detailed Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No more development should take place in Standon/Puckeridge • Standon should be a Larger Service Village • Standon should not be identified for expansion; the High Street is used as car park and the charm of the village has disappeared as it is used as a rat run, a further issue is the loss of local employment • Stanstead Abbots is a town and is much larger than other Larger Service Village e.g. Hunsdon and Puckeridge • Stanstead Abbots and St Margarets should retain its current categorisation as a settlement between the district's main towns and larger villages in the development hierarchy • Stanstead Abbots is not a Larger Service Village • The three Parishes of Stanstead Abbots, St Margarets and Great Amwell have separate identities • Stapleford should be an Other Village/Hamlet • Tewin should not a Category 1 Village – it should be re-designated as a Category 2 Village • Tewin is a small village, not a service village • Tewin is not a Larger Service Village • Tewin should be a Smaller Service Village • Thundridge is not a Smaller Service Village • Thundridge should be a Larger Service Village • Thundridge/Wadesmill should be a Larger Service Village • The Local Plan Inspector concluded that Thundridge/Wadesmill should be a Category 1 Village • Walkern is not a Larger Service Village • Walkern has suffered a disproportionate level of development over past years as result of inappropriate categorisation of village as a Category 1 Village • Walkern should be a Smaller Service Village • Not Watton-at-Stone • Watton-at-Stone should be a Smaller Service Village • Widford is not a Smaller Service Village • Widford should be a Larger Service Village • Why are Watton-at-Stone & Stanstead Abbots Larger Service Villages and Buntingford is a town? • Datchworth seems larger than Tewin but they are identified the other way round • Tewin has fewer facilities than Datchworth – one is wrong • Whilst some villages may be large (e.g. Much Hadham Hunsdon & Puckeridge) they have few facilities & services
Other villages which should be identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ardeley Parish should be a Category 2 Village, which includes hamlets • Albury should be a Smaller Service Village • Anstey should be a Smaller Service Village • Aston End could accommodate some development • Barley should be a Smaller Service Village [NB not in district] • Barkway should be a Larger Service Village [NB not in district] • Barkway should be a Smaller Service Village [NB not in district] • Bramfield should be a Smaller Service Village • Brent Pelham should be included • Clavering should be a Smaller Service Village [NB not in district] • Cottered should be a Smaller Service Village • Cottered should be a Larger Service Village • Dane End should be a Smaller Service Village • Eastwick should be a Smaller Service Village

Q41 - Summary Comment	Q41 - Detailed Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gilston should be a Smaller Service Village • Great Hormead should be a Smaller Service Village • Hare Street should be a Smaller Service Village • Hertingfordbury should be a Smaller Service Village • What about Hertingfordbury • Little Berkhamsted should be a Smaller Service Village • Stocking Pelham should be a Smaller Service Village • Tonwell could sustain some growth for young families • Wareside should be a Smaller Service Village • Westmill should be a Smaller Service Village • Why are Hare Street / Aspenden not included? • Add Tewin Wood, Digswell and Harmer Green also Oaklands & Woolmer Green [NB not all in district]
<p>General comments on overall approach</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The basis for the identification of villages under each village type should be published and updated where applicable • Build away from existing towns and villages, e.g. A120/A10 corridor, M11 near Stansted, North/South Duxford • Need to consider infrastructure first, including access to passenger transport • Priority should be given to settlements with access to rail and other facilities, (e.g. Watton-at-Stone, Stanstead Abbots) • Only develop brownfield sites in villages, no incursion into the Green Belt • Designation irrelevant as expansion of any village would require uneconomic investment in infrastructure • Concentrate development in the towns and larger villages • No development in villages • Villages are unique and don't need development to spoil their beauty and quality • Keep villages rural • Expand towns • No development in smaller villages due to lack of infrastructure and to protect countryside, water resources etc • To simply group villages together which may benefit a few shops or schools but ignores existing problems of traffic, local employment etc is grossly neglectful • None of the 'larger' service villages have all of the following – enough vehicle access/parking, more than 1 shop, a doctor, public amenities – developers cannot be made to provide or service this support • Every village, however small it is, needs some (low cost) housing for young / local people • Every village should have houses built to take the strain off the major roads • All villages should have a small amount of growth to share the pain and to ensure gradual evolution • Limited development in Smaller Service Villages is an ideal way to spread the overall development required, without in any way spoiling the overall appeal of East Herts • Count all villages on an equal basis • Categorisation of some smaller serviced villages and hamlets is incorrect base on transport links • Need to consider whether adding growth to a particular village would change its category – if you develop a village it stops being a village; if you develop a town, you rarely change its nature • Possibly build in the smaller villages and distribute houses for local people to live in, allowing a real village community • Clarify how many services are required when distinguishing between smaller service villages and other villages/hamlets • Smaller and larger service villages seems a fair description; towns should also be split

Q41 - Summary Comment	Q41 - Detailed Comment
	<p>into 'large' and 'small' depending on a) road network b) transport network c) shopping facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ranking not possible without costed infrastructure plans • The smaller the village the less houses. But they must be in character and for local people with local jobs • Development in Smaller Service Villages should be according to local need • Cannot comment on Other Villages/Hamlets as these have not been listed • Query over Other Villages/Hamlets because of numbers involved plus how they are defined • Some villages like Wadesmill and Thundridge are on relatively major roads whilst others like Much Hadham are tucked away with few transport links • Putting people in villages means they get straight in their cars to drive to the towns, we must have less car use • Most villages large or small require a car, think carbon footprint • Some Larger Service Villages were previously classified a (2) not (1), they should now return to that status • Why are Little Hadham and Hadham Ford separate whereas Much Hadham and Hadham Cross are joined to make a larger village? • One third of the population of East Herts live in the rural areas. By increasing the housing in rural areas this could help the sustainability of the rural area i.e. greater viability for shops and bus services and lessen the urban growth of the main towns • Incorporate the villages but keep their character and improve their facilities i.e. transport and schools • There are more viable options just over District borders e.g. Barkway / Barley • Small net changes to villages using residential property as an incentive for developers to build new retail and service areas • Every village 100 homes, to help local schools, shops, amenities etc. Roads would not have to be major • No development in High Cross, Wadesmill and Thundridge – you have spent millions of pounds by-passing and quietening these villages, do not turn them back into a motorway again • The villages and hamlets should not be expanded but infill where sensible • Do not include very small villages/hamlets. Concentrate on larger villages to make them more sustainable. This may mean linking up with smaller villages close by • Maybe add a few dwellings in all options • No garden grabbing
Neighbourhood Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build in villages, with their consent, this could enable them to support local facilities • Each village should be asked to confirm its designated status. If it disagrees, its wishes should be respected • No problem with the villages under each village type, but this is more for the inhabitants of these villages to comment on
Miscellaneous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure protection of Green Belt between Aston and Stevenage • Build flats (5-6 storeys) to conserve countryside • The classifications identify that a service exists but no consideration is given to their potential for development • Starter homes and retirement homes needed to meet local need • Poor services in villages would result in additional cars travelling to rail stations (commuting) • A usable village should have a shop, post office and pub to avoid unnecessary travel • Town folk and country folk don't mix • Policies needed to support the maintenance of village services, including bus services • Last 2 categories must be included • Walkern has more than enough social housing

Q41 - Summary Comment	Q41 - Detailed Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concentrate funding for new amenities in larger service villages • Other Villages/Hamlets are not shown on the map • Aston is unique given its proximity to a wide range of facilities in Stevenage • Ask this to the existing MPs and MEPs and explore our area yourselves, on foot and on footpaths. Ask all the organisations such as National Trust, and Natural England and real experts too. • Better public transport services to and between villages • Not qualified to answer this question • Leave it you • Benington no longer has a shop or post office but needs one • The transport links for trains need to be improved greatly. Living beyond Broxbourne is a nightmare - the travel on trains is dire and the bus links are non-existent. • Make sure villages where East Herts councillors live are not saved from development. • No GP Surgery in High Cross • The shop in Thundridge has closed • In villages/hamlets provide small business units / shops with accommodation • When is hamlet a village and when is a village a collection of hamlets? • Groups of 5-10 houses, not 6-10 bedrooms in villages, all with off street parking for a minimum of two cars • Irrelevant plans will not protect village heritage and character • Would like a safe off road route of Restricted Byway Status between Walkern and Stevenage Box Wood • Safeguard the post offices, village schools and local pubs • The problem with development in each of these settlements are roads - overused, public transport - minimal, water drains & other services - pressure. All these villages have too heavy traffic through them
Site specific comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land to west of Stanstead Abbots & St Margarets

Comments received to Q41 in respect of other issues in Chapter 9

Q41 - Summary Comment	Q41 - Detailed Comment
Approach to identifying three types of village	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More categories of villages required • New category required based on villages with railway stations thereby offering sustainable travel options e.g. Watton-at-Stone, Stanstead Abbots • The distinction between Larger Service Villages and Smaller Service Villages should be further should be further categorised according to access and sustainability. As such, Great Amwell should score higher because of its public transport links and better sustainable location than say Much Hadham • Category of Larger Service Villages seems to be misconceived • The Core Strategy should consider potential development strategies which would allow a more nuanced approach to the level of development to be allocated to each settlement. Settlements such as Watton-at-Stone should be allocated more development than other villages such as High Cross, which do not have the same range of facilities or sustainable transport connections. The consultation document is wrong to include these villages on a par in all of its development strategy options, and further options, based more closely on the principles of sustainable development, must be tested • The village categories are not sufficiently granular. Consider each village on an individual basis
Map	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under Option F Cole Green, Birch Green and Letty Green are wrongly positioned • Inconsistency between maps as to how Stanstead Abbots is portrayed – sometimes on its own, sometimes with St Margarets

Comments received to Q41 in respect of other Chapters

Chapter 2: Key Issues and Vision

Q41 - Summary Comment	Q41 - Detailed Comment
Theme 3: Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repair run down properties and only build new homes when necessary • Make certain large number of homes is really necessary, what about large number of empty homes?
Theme 6: On the Move	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home working should be encouraged to reduce the need to travel

Chapter 3: Development Strategy

Q41 - Summary Comment	Q41 - Detailed Comment
Q22: Development Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to see a development strategy that reflects current realities and needs, rather than outdated assumptions, the desires of developers and as abolished quango • Do not build
Option C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong support for Option C provided the allocation of houses is based on need and not pro rata on existing populations
Housing Number	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree with the assumption that such large numbers of houses are needed
New Town	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a new town south of Newport, west of junction 8A M11, with a new train link and station, with Uttlesford and Essex • Don't destroy the character of our towns and villages, build a new town
Green Belt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East Herts needs to oppose review of Green Belt east of Stevenage • Keep Green Belt intact

Question 42: An Emerging Vision for the Villages

Subject to whichever development strategy options we choose, do you agree with our emerging vision for the villages?

39 people/organisations provided comments in relation to Question 42. These included:

- 19 Individuals
- 8 Developers/landowners/agents/businesses
- 5 Stakeholders/organisations including:
 - Environment Agency
 - Epping Forest District Council
 - Haileybury School
 - Hertfordshire Biological Records Centre
 - The Thatching Information Service
- 7 Town and Parish Councils including:
 - Aston
 - Benington
 - Hertford Heath
 - Stanstead Abbots
 - Tewin
 - Thorley
 - Walkern

Q42 - Summary Comment	Q42 - Detailed Comment
Support generally	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision for each scenario seem to fit the development strategies proposed • Yes with emphasis on the need for affordable housing, better bus routes and scattered development for local families and farmers
Disagree with emerging vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too superficial / artificial • Too broad-brush when each village/settlement is unique • Depends on too many external factors • Will not protect character of villages • Will not protect villages from development • Can't agree or disagree until an option is chosen • The vision is cautious / lacks imagination
Option A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no problems with the current situation - if people do not wish to travel to services they will not move to the area
Option B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support vision that larger service villages will be vibrant communities
Option C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the only option that provides for some growth in smaller service villages • Support aim to create vibrant rural communities with a choice of social and economic opportunities, however, it should apply to all communities whatever their size
Option D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option D allows for the villages to react and develop to future demands but only if the change is driven by their local populations in response to local needs • If Option D is chosen, other villages/hamlets should only grow to accommodate local homes for local people where there are jobs to support them, local people must support development, and it should be appropriate in scale and character • Affordable housing is necessary; the minimum amount of land must be used; local employment must be created – only Option D allows this (although vision doesn't quite encapsulate this)
Option E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision supported as it protects all villages from development
Option F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for development strategy for Great Amwell under Option F
Vision needs amending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The emerging vision for all options should include the words 'their historic character will have been preserved'
Individual village visions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Larger Service Villages should each have their own vision • All villages should have their own vision • Each village has its own character and cannot be 'quantified' in the way that is attempted in the document
Vision - general	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hockerton Housing Project in Nottinghamshire engenders a much closer link between houses and the land – part of the villages vision could be an increase in this type of housing and living • Inter-related settlement groups could share facilities, including development of local energy, waste disposal and sustainable transport networks could be part of an alternative vision for the villages
Neighbourhood planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local parish plan / village design statement is the most representative / appropriate way forward – should be adopted by the Council
General village comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There must be a more flexible approach to future housing / local employment needs and an awareness of the vibrancy that could be created in small pockets of the rural landscape • There should be minimal no/development in villages • Specific policies are needed to support and protect village services • Needs to be a LDF for villages where limited small scale and infill development is allowed for either housing or employment • Village boundaries need to be carefully defined • Areas of green space in villages need to be identified and conserved • The council should continue to vigorously defend Aston End from coalescence with Stevenage

Q42 - Summary Comment	Q42 - Detailed Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large scale development could result in rural ghettos • Thorley has been ignored in the document, yet it has already suffered from large scale development to the point of near extinction of identity and community well being • There is no mention of flood risk in any of the visions. There are areas of flood risk in the following villages: Braughing, Walkern, High Cross, Standon, Puckeridge, Watton-at-Stone, Stapleford, Thundridge, Wadesmill and Dane End. • Concern that large tracts of land around Hunsdon have been identified in the Call for Sites
Miscellaneous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not qualified to answer this question
Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document is too complex and long
Agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document lacks any sort of analysis of agriculture

Comments received to Q42 in respect of other issues in Chapter 9

Q42 - Summary Comment	Q42 - Detailed Comment
Identifying types of villages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More granular categories needed • Categorisation of villages is broadly correct • Needs to be an approach based on local demonstrated needs • Villages should be further categorised according to access and sustainability – as such Great Amwell should score higher than say Much Hadham • It is wrong to categorise villages and then treat all villages with each category in the same way.
Village identification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thundridge should be identified as a Larger Service Village

Comments received to Q42 in respect of other Chapters

Chapter 2: Key Issues and Vision

Q42 - Summary Comment	Q42 - Detailed Comment
Theme 4: East Herts Character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should be mandatory that a small percentage of new building is thatched (using local companies)
Theme 8: Green East Herts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over the impact of further water from the River Beane upon the environment of the Beane Valley

Chapter 3: Development Strategy

Q42 - Summary Comment	Q42 - Detailed Comment
Development Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development must be spread equally amongst all towns, villages and hamlets – this is unlikely to significantly change the character of any of them • Any strategy adopted must enable communities to retain separate communities • Inter-related settlement groups are another option for managing settlement planning • Growth must be apportioned between each settlement on the basis of the range of facilities that they provide, their accessibility and their land availability, rather than on a strictly proportional basis
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial increases in housing should not be approved until necessary parking is provided at stations at affordable prices
Conservation Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any development should be consistent with and proportionate to the character of Conservation Areas